

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to **FIGs. 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9A and 10**. Drawing sheets **1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9** and **11**, which includes **FIGs. 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9A and 10**, replaces the original sheets including **FIGs. 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9A and 10**. In **FIGs. 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9A and 10**, the word “**Intermediary**” was previously misspelled and in **FIG. 9A** the word “**Royalty**” was previously misspelled. The correct spellings of the words have been inserted.

A fresh set of drawing sheets are attached with a letter to the draftsperson which includes the amendments described above.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 – 36, 39-44, 84-86, 144-154 and 156-158 are pending allowed. Claims 37, 38 and 155 were previously presented, but apparently withdrawn by the examiner.

I. Specification

In the specification, the paragraphs [0006], [0008], [0012], [0014], [0021], [0037], [0042], [0043], [0067], [0069], [0075], [0078], [0083], [0084], [0085], [0086], [0089], [0092], [0093], [0099], [00101], [00102], [00103], [00104], [00109], [00110], and [00111] have been amended to correct minor editorial problems.

II. Figures

FIGs. 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9A and 10 have been amended to correct spelling.

III. Claims

Claims 1 – 158 were the subject of a three-way restriction requirement initiating by the examiner in the office action mailed on January 13, 2006. Applicant elected the claims drawn to a Data Processing Method for a Service Contract (FIGs. 6 – 10) in Group I with traverse. This set of claims should include claims 37, 38 and 155, however but those claims were not listed in the Notice of Allowability.

It is respectfully asserted that each of claims 37, 38 and 155 depend from a claim that belongs to the group of claims drawn to a Data Processing Method for a Service Contract of Group I and, therefore, claims 37, 38 and 155 are also drawn to a Data Processing Method for a Service Contract of Group I. Furthermore, since each of the claims depend from an allowable claim, it is respectfully asserted that no further consideration is necessary, nor is an updated search required.

As such, it is respectfully asserted that claims 1 - 44, 84 - 86 and 144 - 158 are in condition for allowability under claim Group I.

Furthermore, although claims **84 – 86** have been allowed by the examiner as also drawn to a Data Processing Method for a Service Contract of Group I, Applicant suggests that these claims are system claims and may more correctly be drawn to a Data Processing System Apparatus (**FIGs. 2 & 5**) and therefore belong to claim Group II.

IV. Prior Art Considered by the Examiner

Two Information disclosure statements and the accompanying Form PTO-1449 which listed the references, along with the required references, were filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on March 29, 2001 and November 19, 2001, respectively. These were received by the Patent and Trademark Office and made a part of the electronic filewrapper record. Neither Form PTO-1449 from those two IDS submissions has been returned to the Applicant with the examiner initials showing the examiner considered the prior art references. Copies of the Information Disclosure Statements contained in the USPTO filewrapper have been reproduced below at pages 55 – 60 for the examiner's convenience.

Therefore, Applicant requests that each of the Form PTO-1449's be initialed by the examiner and a copy returned to the Applicant.

Additionally, in at least the Office Actions mailed on February 17, 2004 and May 05, 2005, the examiner relied on DENNING, et al., "Baltic Freight Futures: Random Walk Or Seasonally Predictable?", International Review of Economics and Finance 3(4), (1994) pp. 399-428 ISBN 1059-0560. However, the Denning reference was never cited on a Form PTO- 892 (Notice of References Cited) as a cited reference.

Therefore, Applicant requests that Form PTO-892 be produced listing the Denning reference as a cited reference.

VII. Conclusion

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: February 20, 2007



Rudolph J. Buchel, Jr.
Reg. No. 43,448

Attorney for Applicant

Rudolph J. Buchel, Jr., PC
P.O. Box 702526
Dallas, Texas 75370-2526
(972) 930-9449 TELEPHONE
(866) 930-9449 TOLL FREE
(972) 930-9446 FACSIMILE
r.buchel@buchel-ip.com EMAIL